

PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY
(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/053046

International filing date (day/month/year)
22.11.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)
03.12.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
G06K7/10

Applicant
MONEY CONTROLS LIMITED

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2
NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas
Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl
Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016

Authorized Officer

Telephone No. +31 70 340-



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

10/581379
International application No.
PCT/EP2004/053046

AP9 Rec'd PCT/PTO 02 JUN 2006

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - ☐ in written format
 - ☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

Box No. II Priority

1. ☒ The validity of the priority claim has not been considered because the International Searching Authority does not have in its possession a copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed or, where required, a translation of that earlier application. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1) is the claimed priority date.
2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. Additional observations, if necessary:

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	6,7,9-14,16,17,23,24,26-30,32-45,47-49
	No: Claims	1-5,8,15,18-22,25,31,46
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-49
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-49
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Reference is made to the following documents:

- D1: WO 02/17215 A (HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC) 28 February 2002 (2002-02-28)
D2: WO 03/034355 A (MONEY CONTROLS; ORTON, DAVID; ALLEN, MICHAEL; ROLLINS, RONALD; SWETEL,) 24 April 2003 (2003-04-24)

Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Clarity (Art. 6 PCT).

Claims 1, 18, 31, 32, 45

Although claims 1, 18, 31, 32, 45 have been drafted as separate independent claims, they appear to relate effectively to the same subject-matter because claims 31, 32 and 45 contain all the features of claim 1 or 18, and claims 1 and 18 differ from each other only with regard to the wording and/or the terminology used for the features of that subject-matter. The aforementioned claims therefore lack conciseness and as such do not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT.

Claims 15, 46

Although claims 15 and 46 have been drafted as separate independent claims, they appear to relate effectively to the same subject-matter because claims 15 and 46 differ from each other only with regard to the wording and/or the terminology used for the features of that subject-matter. The aforementioned claims therefore lack conciseness and as such do not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT.

2. Novelty (Art. 33 (2) PCT).

Claim 1

The document D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this

document):

a bar code scanner (pag. 1, lin. 5-7) comprising light source means (pag. 8, lin. 19 - pag. 9, lin. 1, pag. 14, lin. 5-7; fig. 1), light detector means (pag. 8, lin. 19-21, pag. 9, lin. 1-3; fig. 1) and a light transmissive slit (pag. 9, lin. 3-7; fig. 1) arranged for being brought into proximity with a bar code for scanning thereof (pag. 9, lin. 9-12; fig. 1), the light source means being configured for directing a beam through said slit and the light detector means being configured for detecting light from said beam reflected back through the slit (pag. 9, lin. 15-18; fig. 1).

As all the features of claim 1 are present in the same combination in document D1, the subject-matter of claim 1 is not new (Article 33 (2) PCT).

Claim 18

The document D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document):

a bar code scanner (pag. 1, lin. 5-7) comprising:
a light transmissive slit (pag. 9, lin. 3-7; fig. 1),
light source means for directing a beam through said slit (pag. 8, lin. 19 - pag. 9, lin. 1, pag. 9, lin. 15-18, pag. 14, lin. 5-7; fig. 1), and
light detector means for detecting light from said beam reflected back through the slit (pag. 8, lin. 19-21, pag. 9, lin. 1-3 and 15-18; fig. 1),
wherein the slit is arranged for being brought into proximity to a bar code for scanning thereof (pag. 9, lin. 9-12; fig. 1).

As all the features of claim 18 are present in the same combination in document D1, the subject-matter of claim 18 is not new (Article 33 (2) PCT).

Claim 31

The document D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document):

a bar code scanner (pag. 1, lin. 5-7) comprising:
a member having a slit (pag. 9, lin. 3-7 and 9-12; fig. 1),
a light source means for directing light obliquely through said slit in a plane normal to and aligned with said slit (pag. 8, lin. 19 - pag. 9, lin. 1, pag. 9, lin. 15-18, pag. 9, lin. 21 - pag. 10, lin. 4, pag. 14, lin. 5-7; fig. 1), and
a light detector means for receiving light passing through the slit along a path normal thereto (pag. 8, lin. 19-21, pag. 9, lin. 1-3 and 15-18, pag. 9, lin. 22 - pag. 10, lin. 1; fig. 1),
wherein the light source means and the light detector means are on the same side of said member (fig. 1).

As all the features of claim 31 are present in the same combination in document D1, the subject-matter of claim 31 is not new (Article 33 (2) PCT).

Claim 15

The subject-matter of claim 15 corresponds in terms of manufacturing method steps to that of claim 1. The objections raised in respect of this latter claim, therefore, also apply, mutatis mutandis, to claim 15 (see also pag. 11, lin. 1-3 on document D1) which is thus not new (Article 33 (2) PCT).

Claim 46

The subject-matter of claim 46 corresponds in terms of manufacturing method steps to that of claim 1. The objections raised in respect of this latter claim, therefore, also apply, mutatis mutandis, to claim 46 (see also pag. 11, lin. 1-3 on document D1) which is thus not new (Article 33 (2) PCT).

Claims 2-5, 8, 19-22, 25

The subject-matter of dependent claims 2-5, 8, 19-22, 25 is also not new (Article 33 (2) PCT) because the same additional features are present in the same combination in document D1:

- Claims 2-5, 19-22: pag. 9, lin. 21 - pag. 10, lin. 4, fig. 1;

- Claims 8, 25: pag. 9, lin. 3-10, fig. 1, 2. It is pointed out that the additional subject-matter of claims 8, 25 does not in any case involve an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT) because it is a matter of normal design option.

3. Inventive Step (Art. 33 (3) PCT).

Claim 32

The document D1, which is considered to represent the most relevant state of the art, discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document):

a bar code scanner (pag. 1, lin. 5-7) comprising:
a light transmissive slit (pag. 9, lin. 3-7; fig. 1),
light source means for directing a beam through said slit (pag. 8, lin. 19 - pag. 9, lin. 1, pag. 9, lin. 15-18, pag. 14, lin. 5-7; fig. 1), and
light detector means for detecting light from said beam reflected back through the slit (pag. 8, lin. 19-21, pag. 9, lin. 1-3 and 15-18; fig. 1),
wherein the slit is arranged for being brought into proximity to a bar code for scanning thereof (pag. 9, lin. 9-12; fig. 1).

The subject-matter of claim 32 differs from document D1 in that:

the bar code scanner is comprised in a sheet validator including a sheet path along which a sheet to be validated is passed.

Sheet validators including a sheet path along which a sheet to be validated is passed and employing a bar code scanner as validating sensor along the sheet path are well known in the art, see for example document D2 (pag. 4, lin. 9-25, pag. 5, lin. 1-9, pag. 5, lin. 29 - pag. 6, lin. 7; fig. 1, 2). The bar code scanner disclosed in document D1 is suitable for being incorporated in other reader/scanner structures (see document D1, pag. 10, lin. 15-17, pag. 11, lin. 4-6). Moreover, neither the bar code scanner nor the sheet validator claimed in claim 32 contain any features which produce a combined special technical effect when employed together. Therefore, the skilled person would

include the bar code scanner disclosed in document D1 in a sheet validator, for example like the one disclosed in document D2, in order to exploit the advantages due to the bar code scanner alone, and thereby arrive to the subject-matter of claim 32 without the need of any inventive activity.

For the above mentioned reasons, the subject-matter of claim 32 does not involve an inventive step (Art. 33(3) PCT).

Claim 45

The document D1, which is considered to represent the most relevant state of the art, discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document):

a bar code scanner (pag. 1, lin. 5-7) comprising:
a member having a slit (pag. 9, lin. 3-7 and 9-12; fig. 1),
a light source means for directing light obliquely through said slit in a plane normal to and aligned with said slit (pag. 8, lin. 19 - pag. 9, lin. 1, pag. 9, lin. 15-18, pag. 9, lin. 21 - pag. 10, lin. 4, pag. 14, lin. 5-7; fig. 1), and
a light detector means for receiving light passing through the slit along a path normal thereto (pag. 8, lin. 19-21, pag. 9, lin. 1-3 and 15-18, pag. 9, lin. 22 - pag. 10, lin. 1; fig. 1),
wherein the light source means and the light detector means are on the same side of said member (fig. 1).

The subject-matter of claim 45 differs from document D1 in that:

the bar code scanner is comprised in a sheet validator including a sheet path along which a sheet to be validated is passed.

Sheet validators including a sheet path along which a sheet to be validated is passed and employing a bar code scanner as validating sensor along the sheet path are well known in the art, see for example document D2 (pag. 4, lin. 9-25, pag. 5, lin. 1-9, pag. 5, lin. 29 - pag. 6, lin. 7; fig. 1, 2). The bar code scanner disclosed in document D1 is suitable for being incorporated in other reader/scanner structures (see document D1,

pag. 10, lin. 15-17, pag. 11, lin. 4-6). Moreover, neither the bar code scanner nor the sheet validator claimed in claim 45 contain any features which produce a combined special technical effect when employed together. Therefore, the skilled person would include the bar code scanner disclosed in document D1 in a sheet validator, for example like the one disclosed in document D2, in order to exploit the advantages due to the bar code scanner alone, and thereby arrive to the subject-matter of claim 45 without the need of any inventive activity.

For the above mentioned reasons, the subject-matter of claim 45 does not involve an inventive step (Art. 33(3) PCT).

Claims 6, 7, 9-14, 16, 17, 23, 24, 26-30, 33-44, 47-49

Dependent claims 6, 7, 9-14, 16, 17, 23, 24, 26-30, 33-44, 47-49 do not appear to contain any additional features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT with respect to inventive step.

The reasons are the following:

- Claims 6, 7, 9-13, 23, 24, 26-30, 37, 38, 40-44:
the additional features of claims 6, 7, 9-13, 23, 24, 26-30, 37, 38, 40-44 are a matter of normal design option;
- Claims 14, 17, 48: see the remarks for claim 32;
- Claims 33-36: the additional features of claims 33-36 are disclosed in the same combination in document D1 (pag. 9, lin. 21 - pag. 10, lin. 4, fig. 1);
- Claim 39: the additional features of claim 39 are disclosed in the same combination in document D1 (pag. 9, lin. 3-10; fig. 1, 2) and are in any case a matter of normal design option;
- Claims 16, 47: the additional features of claims 16, 47 are a matter of normal design option;
- Claim 49: see the remarks for claims 32 and 47.